

## REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated December 15, 2006. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended herein. Claims 20 to 23 are new. No new matter has been added by the amendment or the new claims. A petition for a one-month extension of time is submitted herewith. A Terminal Disclaimer is submitted herewith. Please charge deposit account 02-1818 to cover the cost of the one-month extension, the Terminal Disclaimer, the new claims and any other related expenses.

The Office Action objected to the drawings. More specifically, the Office Action objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 36 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "80" has been used to designate an indicator (pg. 10, line 32), a symbol indicator (pg. 10, line 31) and a translating symbol indicator (pg. 10, lines 9 and 31). In response, the Specification has been amended to consistently refer to reference character 80 as a "symbol indicator." Accordingly, the objections to the drawings should be withdrawn in view of same.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Office Action alleges that it is unclear as to whether Claim 1 refers to the reel depicted by reference numeral 34 or the reel depicted by reference numeral 70. Amended Claim 1 recites, at least in part, an indicator operable to rotate about an axis as the indicator translates relative to the reel *and* operable to sequentially indicate different ones of the symbols displayed by the reel. Figure 1A clearly illustrates a display device 60 that includes both a rotatable reel 70 and an indicator operable to translate relative to the reel. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is sufficiently clear, and that the §112 rejection is improper and should be withdrawn for at least the reasons above.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2 and 7 on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over Claims 1, 15, 21, 27 and 31 to 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,712,694 to Nordman ("Nordman I"). In addition, the Office Action rejected Claims 1 to 13 on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over Claims 1 to 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,905,407 to Nordman ("Nordman II"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with and

traverses the nonstatutory double patenting rejections. In addition, the Terminal Disclaimer submitted with this response overcomes these rejections.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1 to 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,336,863 to Baerlocher et al. ("Baerlocher") and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,584,763 to Kelley et al. ("Kelly"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses this rejection. In addition, as stated above, Claims 1 and 7 were amended to more clearly define the invention.

Amended independent Claim 1 recites, at least in part, a display device including an indicator *operable to rotate about an axis as the indicator translates relative to the reel* and operable to sequentially indicate different ones of the symbols displayed by the reel, the indicator including a *plurality of pointers* that are operable to sequentially point toward the reel as the indicator is rotated about the axis.

Amended independent Claim 7 recites, at least in part, a display device including a symbol display operable to simultaneously display a plurality of first symbols, and a first symbol indicator *operable to rotate about an axis as the symbol indicator moves substantially parallel to the symbol display* to indicate different ones of the first symbols displayed by the symbol display, the first symbol indicator including a *plurality of pointers* operable to sequentially point towards the symbol display as the first symbol indicator is rotated about the axis

Independent Claim 14 recites, at least in part, a method of operating a gaming device including simultaneously displaying a plurality of symbols on a symbol display, *translating a symbol indicator relative to the display of symbols*, and rotating the symbol indicator so that multiple pointers extending from the symbol indicator sequentially point towards the display.

The Office Action alleges that Baerlocher teaches all of the elements of Claims 1, 7 and 14 with the exception of a plurality of pointers. (See, Office Action, pg. 7). Baerlocher provides a bonus selector 36 (i.e., an indicator) in the form of a rotating stationary pointer that is positioned in the center of a bonus wheel. (See, Baerlocher, col. 3, lines 37 to 38). However, as mentioned above, Claims 1, 7 and 14 recite, in part, an indicator operable to *translate* relative to the reel, the indicator including a *plurality* of pointers that are operable to sequentially point toward the reel as the indicator is rotated

about an axis *and the axis translates (or moves substantially parallel) with the indicator*. Therefore, Claims 1, 7, 14 and dependents thereof are not rendered obvious from Baerlocher for at least these reasons.

The Office Action relies on Kelly merely for the purported teaching of a plurality of pointers. Similar to Baerlocher, Kelly discloses circular display having a rotating symbol indicator. The indicator in Kelly does not include an axis of rotation that translates or moves in parallel with respect to anything. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Baerlocher and Kelly does not render obvious Claims 1 to 19, even assuming they are properly combinable.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of Claims 1 to 19.

New independent Claim 20 recites, at least in part, *rotating a symbol indicator about an axis as the symbol indicator translates relative to the display of symbols*, wherein *multiple pointers* extending from the symbol indicator sequentially point towards the display. Claim 20 and dependents thereof are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given above.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance and in the absent of more pertinent art such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



---

Adam H. Masia  
Reg. No. 35,602  
Cust. No. 29159

Dated: April 12, 2006